of peaks and valleys for engaging a wall of the great coronary vein branch at a predetermined number of discrete, longitudinally spaced points for holding the electrode relatively fixed in position irrespective of forces due to body movements and blood flow in the coronary vein and coronary sinus vein and for decoupling said forces from the lead tip.

Please cancel Claim 2.

(Amended). The lead as in [any one of] Claim [2 and] 1 or 8 wherein the peaks and valleys are located over a length from about 4 to 20 centimeters proximally of the electrode.

8 ~ (Amended). The lead as in any one of Claims 1 or 2 through [6] 5 wherein an outer diameter of the lead body is in a range from about 3 Fr to 5 Fr.

(Amended). The lead as in [Claims 2 and 3] Claim 1
wherein the wave has an amplitude in a range from about 0.5 to
4.0 centimeters, peak-to-peak.

(Amended). The lead as in [any one of Claims 2 and]

Claim 1 or 2 and further including means located at the peaks and valleys for imparting a shape bias thereat.

(Amended). The lead as in Claim 10 wherein the means for imparting a shape bias comprises [a] at least one premolded polymer element[(s)] disposed along a predetermined portion of the lead body.

Please cancel Claim 14.

(Amended). The lead as in Claim 15 wherein the conductor [is] comprises a braided cable.

(Amended). The lead as in Claim 16 wherein the preformed shape [is] comprises a wave exhibiting a series of peaks and valleys.

Please cancel Claim 18.

wherein the zone extends over a length from about 4 to 20 centimeters proximally of the electrode.

wherein an outer diameter of the lead body is in a range from about 3 Fr to 5 Fr.

(Amended). The lead as in any one of Claims 17[-] or 19 wherein the wave has an amplitude in a range of from about 0.5 to 4.0 centimeters, peak-to-peak.

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the first Official Action of February 1, 1999. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims remaining in the application are respectfully requested.

The objection to the drawings set out in paragraph 3 of the Detailed Action" has been noted and Claim 14 has been canceled, thus obviating the objection.

Claims 7 and 8 have been amended to obviate the objection as being in improper multiple dependent form.

The claim rejections based upon 35 U.S.C. §112 have also been obviated. Specifically, the limitations of Claim 2 have